arXiv:hep-th/0405003v1 30 Apr 2004

The Topology of $SU(\infty)$ and the Group of Area-Preserving Diffeomorphisms of a Compact 2-manifold

John Swain

Department of Physics, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115, USA

email: john.swain@cern.ch

(April 29, 2004)

ABSTRACT

Given the interest in relating the large N limit of $SU(N)$ to groups of area-preserving diffeomorphisms, we consider the topologies of these groups and show that both in terms of homology and homotopy, they are extremely different. Similar conclusions are drawn for other infinite dimensional classical groups.

I. INTRODUCTION

Groups of area-preserving diffeomorphisms and their Lie algebras have recently been the focus of much attention in the physics literature. Hoppe [1] has shown that in a suitable basis, the Lie algebra of the group $SDiff(S^2)$ of area-preserving diffeomorphisms of a sphere tends to that of $SU(N)$ as $N \to \infty$. This has obvious interest in connection with gauge theories of $SU(N)$ for large N. The idea of $SU(N)$ for finite N as an approximation to the group of area-preserving diffeomorphisms has also been used in studies of supermembranes

[2–4], and in particular has been used to argue for their instability.

The limiting procedure as $N \to \infty$ is delicate, and in particular, the need to take the limit in a particular basis makes one immediately wary as to how this result should be interpreted. In fact Hoppe and Schaller [5] have shown that there are infinitely many pairwise non-isomorphic Lie algebras, each of which tends to $su(\infty)$, the Lie algebra of $SU(\infty)$, as $N \to \infty$. The authors of references [3], [4], and [6] have especially emphasized the difficulties in relating such infinite limits with Lie algebras of area-preserving diffeomorphisms. Various authors have considered special limits and/or large-N limits of other classical Lie algebras [7–11] as relevant for 2-manifolds other than spheres. In general, the approaches in the literature concentrate on the Lie algebras of the groups of interest, though there is a global viewpoint showing the inequivalence $SDiff(S^2)$ and a certain action of $SU(N)$ provided by the Majorana representation [12] of states of a spin-j system by sets of points on a sphere [13].

The purpose of this Letter is to examine the topology of the groups of area-preserving diffeomorphisms of compact 2-manifolds and make a comparison to the topology of $SU(N)$ both for finite N and in the limit of $N \to \infty$. In addition, we examine the topology of other infinite limits of classical groups and compare to $SDiff(M)$.

II. CENTRAL EXTENSIONS AND TOPOLOGY

The Lie algebra corresponding to the $SDiff(M)$ is the Lie algebra of divergence-free vector fields. There have been discussions in the literature of the central extensions allowed to this algebra [7]. The discussion is based on the observation that divergence-free vector fields are, by the Poincaré lemma, locally given by the curl of some other vector field. Globally, however, there are vector fields whose divergence vanishes but which are not the curl of some other vector field. These can provide central extensions to the Lie algebra and they are labelled by the independent harmonic 1-forms on M. There are $2g$ such independent forms on a 2-manifold of genus g corresponding to the $2g$ elements of $H^1(M, \mathbb{R})$. In [7] an attempt is made to identify two distinct large N limits of the Lie algebra of $SU(N)$, $su(\infty)$ and $su_+(\infty)$ with the $SDiff(M)$ for M a 2-torus and a sphere respectively, based on the observation that the former admits central extensions, while the latter does not. In this letter we concern ourselves not with the Lie algebras of the groups under consideration, but rather with the global topology of the groups themselves.

III. TOPOLOGY OF $SU(\infty)$

The results on de Rham cohomology and homotopy groups of $SU(\infty)$ presented in this section are well-known, but will be needed to compare with corresponding results for groups of area-preserving diffeomorphisms. As far as de Rham cohomology is concerned, $SU(N)$ looks like a product of odd-dimensional spheres [21], so that $SU(2) \cong S^3$, $SU(3) \cong S^3 * S^5$, $SU(4) \cong S^3 * S^5 * S^7$, and $SU(N) \cong S^3 * S^5 * S^7 \cdots * S^{2N-1}$. Equivalently, the de Rham cohomology ring is $H^*(SU(N), \mathbb{R}) = \wedge_{\mathbb{R}}(x_3, x_5, x_7, \ldots, x_{2N-1})$ where $deg(x_i) = i$. The homotopy groups are given by Bott's celebrated periodicity theorem : $\pi_n(SU(\infty)) = Z$ for n odd and $n > 1$, and $\pi_n(SU(\infty)) = 0$ for n even.

IV. TOPOLOGY OF $SDIFF(M)$

In what follows we will restrict out attention to the identity component of the diffeomorphism groups considered, so that, for example, by $Diff(M)$ we will mean the identity component of the group of diffeomorphisms of M. This is not a real restriction as we show with the following argument. If $SDiff_0(M)$ is the identity component of $SDiff(M)$ then we know that

$$SDiff(M)/SDiff_0(M) = D \tag{1}$$

where D is a discrete group, but from this we cannot conclude that $SDiff(M)$ is a direct or semidirect product [14,15]. However, we can now use the exact sequence (see, for example reference [18]) :

$$\pi_j(D) \to \pi_{j-1}(SDiff_0(M)) \to \pi_{j-1}(SDiff(M)) \to \pi_{j-1}(D) \tag{2}$$

and the fact that D is discrete to conclude that $\pi_i(D) = 0$ for $i > 0$ and thus that $\pi_i(SDiff(M)) = \pi_i(SDiff_0(M))$ for $i > 0$.

We start by noting that for any manifold M (not necessarily of two dimensions), $SDiff(M)$ is a deformation retract of the group $Diff(M)$ of diffeomorphisms of a manifold [16,17]. Thus $SDiff(M)$ and $Diff(M)$ have the same homotopy and same de Rham cohomology (see, for example [18]).

Now we need the following result [19,20] from the mathematics literature on $Diff(M)$ for 2-manifolds :

Theorem : For M a compact 2-dimensional manifold, $Diff(M)$ is homotopy equivalent to

1. $SO(3)$ for $M = S^2$ or the projective plane

2. $S^1 \times S^1$ for $M = T^2 = S^1 \times S^1$

3. $SO(2)$ for M a Klein bottle (KB) , Möbius band, disk, or $S^1 \times I$ (I an interval)

4. a point otherwise

Combining this with the fact that $SDiff(M)$ and $Diff(M)$ have the same de Rham cohomology and homotopy groups, we have the following :

Theorem : For M a compact 2-dimensional manifold, $SDiff(M)$ has the same de Rham cohomology and homotopy groups as

1. $SO(3)$ for $M = S^2$ or the projective plane

2. $S^1 \times S^1$ for $M = T^2 = S^1 \times S^1$

3. $SO(2)$ for M a Klein bottle (KB), Möbius band, disk, or $S^1 \times I$ (I an interval)

4. a point otherwise

We will find it convenient to group the compact 2-manifolds into 4 classes corresponding to the 4 numbered items in the above list.

V. COMPARISON OF $SU(\infty)$ AND $SDIFF(M)$

It is straightforward now to find the de Rham cohomology of $SDiff(M)$ and compare it to that of $SU(\infty)$. We list the results for different M in table 1, where we give only one representative from each of the classes above with the understanding, for example, that the results for S^2 apply also to the projective plane, etc. The table continues with vanishing cohomology in higher dimensions for $SDiff(M)$ while $SU(\infty)$ continues to have nonvanishing cohomology in higher dimensions as discussed in section III.

We also present the homotopy groups for $SDiff(M)$ and $SU(\infty)$ in Table 2 with the same understanding that we list only one representative from each of the classes of M. The first column uses the homotopy groups of $SO(3)$ tabuled in [21]. Clearly the columns of Table 1 are all different, as are the columns of Table 2. Thus we find that $SDiff(M)$ is clearly not the same as $SU(\infty)$.

VI. OTHER INFINITE DIMENSIONAL CLASSICAL GROUPS

Claims have been made in the literature [7–11] that various other infinite classical groups can be approximations to $SDiff(M)$. From the foregoing discussion, it should be clear that the same problem of disagreement in homotopy and cohomology will arise. We consider several cases in the following subsections. An excellent general reference for the homotopy and cohomology of the classical groups is reference [21].

A. Large Orthogonal Groups

The group $SO(2N)$ has the de Rham cohomology ring

$$H^*(SO(2N),\mathbb{R}) = \wedge_{\mathbb{R}}(x_3, x_5, x_7, \ldots, x_{4N-5}) \tag{3}$$

while

$$H^*(SO(2N-1),\mathbb{R}) = \wedge_{\mathbb{R}}(x_3, x_5, x_7, \ldots, x_{4N-5}, x_{2N-1}) \tag{4}$$

Thus $SO(\infty)$ has nonvanishing cohomology in many dimensions greater than 2. Its homotopy groups are $\pi_0(SO(\infty)) = Z_2$, $\pi_1(SO(\infty)) = Z_2$, $\pi_2(SO(\infty)) = 0$, $\pi_3(SO(\infty)) = Z$, $\pi_4(SO(\infty)) = 0$, $\pi_5(SO(\infty)) = 0$, $\pi_7(SO(\infty)) = Z$, and $\pi_{n+8}(SO(\infty)) = \pi_n(SO(\infty))$ for $n > 7$.

B. Large Symplectic Groups

The group $Sp(N)$ has the cohomology ring of

$$H^*(Sp(\infty), \mathbb{R}) = \wedge_{\mathbb{R}}(x_3, x_5, x_7, \ldots, x_{4N-1}) \tag{5}$$

and thus also has nonvanishing cohomology in many dimensions greater than 2. Its homotopy groups are $\pi_n(Sp(\infty)) = \pi_{n+4}(SO(\infty))$.

In both the cases of $SO(\infty)$ and $Sp(\infty)$ we see that there are nonvanishing cohomology groups in dimensions over 2, and clear mismatches with homotopy groups of $SDiff(M)$, whatever the choice of M.

C. Other Large Groups

We recall [18] that $\pi_n(A \times B) = \pi_n(A) \times \pi_n(B)$, and the Kunneth formula which states that $H^n(A \times B, \mathbb{R}) = \sum_{l+m=n} H^l(A, \mathbb{R}) \otimes H^m(B, \mathbb{R})$. Thus, in general, the same problems encountered for $SO(\infty)$, $SU(\infty)$, and $Sp(\infty)$ will be met by any products of such groups. Similarly, products of finite dimensional groups with the infinite classical groups will not be diffeomorphic to $SDiff(M)$ for any 2-dimensional manifold M.

VII. CONCLUSION

It is now clear that in terms of topology, $SU(N)$ approximates the topology of $SDiff(M)$ very poorly except in the rather trivial case of $M = S^2$ and $N = 3$. In that case the de Rham cohomology and homotopy are the same ($SU(2)$ is the two-fold cover of $SO(3)$). Limits of the other classical groups also differ in their topology in a similarly dramatic manner. This suggests that great caution be applied in the approximation of area-preserving diffeomorphisms (or, in fact, any diffeomorphisms at all) by limits of $SU(N)$ or other large classical groups. It has been suggested that $SU(\infty)$ might describe a theory of membranes of changing topology [4]. One might even speculate that $SU(\infty)$ describes a theory of not only 2-dimensional objects, but one with strings and point particles as well. In this case, the topological structure of $SU(\infty)$ might be expected to be of importance in mediating transitions between objects of different topologies (or even dimensions?) much as $\pi_3(SU(3)) = Z$ gives the instantons which tunnel between different vacua in QCD.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to my colleagues at Northeastern University and the National Science Foundation for their support.

k	$H^k(SDiff(S^2))$	$H^k(SDiff(T^2))$	$H^k(SDiff(KB))$	$H^k(SDiff(M^g))$	$H^k(SU(\infty))$
1	0	$\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$	$\mathbb{R}$	$\mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{g}}$	0
2	0	0	0	0	0
3	$\mathbb{R}$	0	0	0	$\mathbb{R}$
4	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	$\mathbb{R}$

Table 1. De Rham cohomology groups of $SDiff(M)$ and $SU(\infty)$.

k	$\pi_k(SDiff(S^2))$	$\pi_k(SDiff(T^2))$	$\pi_k(SDiff(KB))$	$\pi_k(SDiff(M^g))$	$\pi_k(SU(\infty))$
1	0	$\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$	$\mathbb{Z}$	$\mathbb{Z}$	0
2	0	0	0	0	0
3	$\mathbb{Z}$	0	0	0	$\mathbb{Z}$
4	$\mathbb{Z}_2$	0	0	0	0
5	$\mathbb{Z}_2$	0	0	0	$\mathbb{Z}$
6	$\mathbb{Z}_{12}$	0	0	0	0
7	$\mathbb{Z}_2$	0	0	0	$\mathbb{Z}$
8	$\mathbb{Z}_2$	0	0	0	0
9	$\mathbb{Z}$	0	0	0	$\mathbb{Z}$
10	$\mathbb{Z}_1$	0	0	0	0
11	$\mathbb{Z}_2$	0	0	0	$\mathbb{Z}$
12	$\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$	0	0	0	0
13	$\mathbb{Z}_{12} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$	0	0	0	$\mathbb{Z}$
14	$\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$	0	0	0	0
15	$\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$	0	0	0	$\mathbb{Z}$

Table 2. Homotopy groups of $SDiff(M)$ and $SU(\infty)$.

---

[1] J. Hoppe, Proceedings, Constraints Theory and Relativistic Dynamics (Florence, 1986) eds. G. Longhi and L Lusana (World Scientific, Singapore, 1987) p. 267; Phys. Lett. **B215** (1988) 706.

[2] B. deWit, J. Hoppe, and H. Nicolai, Nucl. Phys. **B305** (1988) 545.

[3] B. deWit, M. Lüscher, and H. Nicolai, Nucl. Phys. **B320** (1989) 133.

[4] B. de Wit and H. Nicolai, Proceedings, 3^{rd} Hellenic School on Elementary Particle Physics (Corfu, 1989) eds. E. N. Argyres et al. (World Scientific, Singapore) p777.

[5] J. Hoppe and P. Schaller, Phys. Lett. **B237** (1990) 407.

[6] J. Swain, "On the limiting procedure by which $SDiff(T^2)$ and $SU(\infty)$ are associated", `http://arXiv.org/abs/hep-th/0405002`.

[7] C. N. Pope and K. S. Stelle, Phys. Lett. **B226** (1989) 257.

[8] C. N. Pope and L. J. Romans, Class. Quantum. Grav. **7** (1990) 97.

[9] A. Wolski and J. S. Dowker, J. Math. Phys. **32** (1991) 2304.

[10] B. deWit, U. Marquard, and H. Nicolai, Comm. Math. Phys. **128** (1990) 39.

[11] D. V. Vassilevich, Class. Quantum. Grav. **8** (1991) 2163.

[12] E. Majorana, Nuov. Cim. **9** (1932) 43.

[13] J. Swain, "The Majorana representation of spins and the relation between $SU(\infty)$ and

$SDiff(S^2)$", `http://arXiv.org/abs/hep-th/0405004`.

[14] L. O'Raifeartaigh, "Group Structure of Gauge Theories", Cambridge Press 1986, Cambridge.

[15] J. de Siebenthal, Comment. Math Helv. **31** (1956) 41.

[16] H. Omori, "On the group of diffeomorphisms on a compact manifold", in Global Analysis, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. **15**, ed. S. S. Chern and S. Smale (Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1970) 167.

[17] D. Ebin and J. Marsden, Ann. Math. **92** (1970) 101.

[18] R. Bott and L. Tu, "Differential Forms in Algebraic Topology", Springer-Verlag (1982), New York.

[19] C. J. Earl and J. Eells, Bull. Am. Math. Soc. **73** (1967) 557, and C. J. Earl and J. Eells, J. Diff. Geom. **3** (1969) 19.

[20] A. Gramain, "Groupes des difféomorphismes et espace de Teichmüller d'une surface", Séminaire Bourbaki 1972-1973, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics 383 (1974) 157, and A. Gramain "Le type d'homotopie du groupe des difféomorphismes d'une surface compacte", Ann. Sci. de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure **6** (1973) 53.

[21] S. Iyanaga and Y. Kawada(eds.), "Encyclopedic Dictionary of Mathematics", The MIT Press (1977) (Appendix A).